

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PAYSCALE, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SALARY.COM, LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00237-LK

ORDER REQUESTING
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

This matter comes before the Court sua sponte. On May 27, 2025, Plaintiff Payscale, Inc. filed a Motion to Dismiss Defendant Salary.com, LLC’s Counterclaims or Alternatively for a More Definite Statement. Dkt. No. 22. In relevant part, the motion states that—under the Defend Trade Secrets Act (“DTSA”)—“[t]he boundaries of the alleged trade secrets must be described with particularity,” which Payscale says Salary.com fails to do. *Id.* at 8–12. Salary.com objects to this point of law, stating that “nothing in the DTSA requires pleading a trade secret with the particularity Payscale demands.” Dkt. No. 25 at 16–17.

1 On August 12, 2025, the Ninth Circuit issued a precedential opinion addressing the level
2 of particularity required under the DTSA. *Quintara Biosciences, Inc. v. Ruifeng Biztech, Inc.*,
3 No. 23-16093, 2025 WL 2315671 (9th Cir. Aug. 12, 2025). Considering this development, the
4 Court ORDERS each party to provide a supplemental brief of up to 2,100 words within 21 days
5 of this Order addressing whether *Quintara* affects its position on the pending motion.

6 Dated this 25th day of September, 2025.

7 

8

Lauren King
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24